

REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 19-22, 24-46, and 48-102 are pending in the present application. Claims 18, 23 and 47 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 19, 20, 24-28, 36, 48, 49, 52, 71, and 72 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added. Claims 23-26 and 47-54 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter, and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-14, 18-22, 27-44, 55-64, 67-94, and 98-102 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as assertedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,604,792 to Solomon, et al. (hereinafter “Solomon”). Claims 15-17, 45, 46, 65, 66, and 95-97 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Solomon.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to include all limitations in claims 18 and 23. The Examiner has indicated claim 23 as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 2-14, 19-22 and 27-35 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 36 has been amended herein to include all limitations in claim 47. The Examiner has indicated claim 47 as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 36, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 37-44, 55-64, 67-70 and 100 depend from claim 36 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 71 has been amended herein to add the limitation that the querying information further regards “an additional status of an additional calling service associated with said calling party terminal,” in addition to the status of the call redirecting service associated with the called number. Solomon only recites that the querying information is regarding the additional status of the call redirecting service associated with the called number, as recited in column 10, line 10 – column 11, line 4 of Solomon. Nothing in Solomon, however, teaches that the query information also regards the additional status of the calling service associated with the calling party terminal. Thus, Solomon lacks the above-recited limitation, and claim 71 is allowable over Solomon.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 73-74. Claim 73 requires the calling party terminal is in a controlled facility. Claim 73 further requires the calling party terminal is in a prison facility. Nothing in Soloman teaches or suggests such requirements. Claims 73 and 74 are thus allowable over Soloman.

Claims 72-89 and 101 depend from claim 71 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 90. Claim 90 requires “preventing connection of a call to said called number as a function of said obtained information.” In Solomon, for example, column 10, line 10 – column 11, line 4, when a subscriber (doctor) number is called (column 10, lines 11-17 of Solomon), the call is redirected either to subscriber’s home, or to I/P 18 (column 10, lines 30-32 of Solomon), which receives calling party’s message

(column 10, lines 35-40 of Solomon). Nothing in Solomon teaches that the call is prevented as a function of the information.

In addition, Examiner has recited:

with respect to claim 90 ... the claimed information being indicative of a configuration associated with said called number but not indicative of a call completion status of said called number reads on the time period configuration during which the service may be active [or] inactive (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Solomon does not disclose the relationship between a call completion status of the called number and the information that leads to the call prevention. Thus, Solomon is silent regarding whether the information is indicative of the call completion status of the called number or not. Accordingly, Solomon lacks the limitation “said information being ... not indicative of a call completion status of said called number.”

In light of the above discussions, Solomon lacks the limitations and steps recited in claim 90. Claim 90 is thus allowable over Solomon.

Claims 91-94, 98-99 and 102 depend from claim 90 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-14, 19-22, 27-35, 37-44, 55-64, 67-70, 91-94 and 98-100 and 102 without positively identifying which portions of Solomon teach the respective features. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims, or clearly set forth the basis for the rejections in a new non-final office action in order to allow Applicants an opportunity to respond to a properly supported rejection.

Claims 15-17, 45-46, 65-66 and 95-97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,604,792 to Solomon.

Claims 15-17 depend from claim 1. Claims 45-46 and 65-66 depend from claim 36.

Claims 95-97 depend from claim 90. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from the respective allowable independent claims as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Michael J. Fogarty, III, Applicants' attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

November 5, 2007

Date

/Michael J. Fogarty, III/

Michael J. Fogarty, III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,541

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218